



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,755	09/17/2003	Sterling Smith	MSS0007-US	3830
7590	02/01/2006		EXAMINER	
Michael D. Bednarek Shaw Pittman LLP 1650 Tysons Boulevard McLean, VA 22102				NGUYEN, HIEP
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2816

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/663,755	SMITH, STERLING <i>(initials)</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hiep Nguyen	2816	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11-18-05.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

This is responsive to the amendment filed on 11-18-05. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive to overcome the references. Thus, the claims remained rejected under Peterson, Olmstead, Kanawaga, Obie and Kwon. However, the rejections change slightly due to the amendment and newly added claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The limitation " wherein said clamping voltage varies with said bandwidth" is not disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.102 (b) as being anticipated by Peterson et al. (US pat. 5,926,217).

Regarding claim 1, figures 3, 4 and 5c show an interface circuitry of a display chip comprising: an input node receiving an analog input signal from the output of infrared image

Art Unit: 2816

sensor (111); an adjustable filter (117, col.1, lines 59-61) providing a bandwidth in response to a display mode; a clamping circuit (131) for clamping the processed image signal during a clamping interval. It is inherent that the greater the bandwidth, the greater the display resolution is (see USPats. 3,908,193; 3,983,328; 4,676,105; 5,128,549; 5,394,750; 6,497,666, 6,677,882, and 6,681,065).

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the clamping circuit (131) comprises transistor (M9). The connection of the clamp circuit is shown in figure 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olmstead et al. (USP. 5,814,803) in view of Kanagawa et al. (USP. 6,366,866).

Regarding claim 1, figure 10A of olmstead shows an interface circuitry of a display chip comprising: an input node (CCD) for receiving an analog input signal with a display mode; a filter (274); a clamping circuit (S1). Figure 10A of Olmstead does not show that the filter is adjustable. Figure 3 of Kanagawa shows an adjustable filter for adjusting the bandwidth of the analog input signal according to the display mode. Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to replace the fixed filter of Olmstead with the adjustable taught by Kanagawa for adjusting the bandwidth according to the display mode and it is inherent that the greater the bandwidth, the greater the display resolution is (see USPats. 3,908,193; 3,983,328; 4,676,105; 5,128,549; 5,394,750; 6,497,666; 6,677,882 and 6,681,065).

Regarding claim 2, resistor (2111) of the filter (211) is a variable resistor.

Regarding claim 3 and 4, it is well known in the art that clamping switch (S1) is a transistor having a control node controlled by a clamping signal (see US. 6,724,245, Fig.1).

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al. (US pat. 5,926,217) in view of Kwon et al. (US Pat. 6,724,245).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, figures 3 and 4 of Peterson include all the limitations of claims 5 and 6 except for the limitation that the clamping circuit comprises a variable resistor and a transistor. Figure 1 of Kwon shows a clamping circuit comprising a variable resistor (N1) and a transistor (N2) for adjusting the voltage at the internal node (col. 5, lines 12-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the clamping circuit (131) of Peterson with the clamping circuit taught by Kwon for adjusting the voltage at the internal node. The transistor is transistor (N2) and the clamping signal is (clamp_en). It is inherent that the circuit of Peterson works in display mode.

Claims 7-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obie et al. (US Pat. 5,038,096) in view of Olmstead et al. (US Pat. 5,814,803), Kwon et al. (US Pat. 6,724,245) and Kanagawa et al. (US Pat. 6,366,866).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, figure 1 of Obie shows an interface circuitry of a display chip comprising;

an input node for receiving an analog image signal with a display resolution; note that every video signal has a display resolution.

a video filter (112) for processing said analog image signal and providing a processed image signal at internal node;

an ADC unit (118) for converting said processed image signal into a digital image signal. Figure 1 of Obie does not show a clamping circuit connecting between said internal node and a reference level and the filter is adjustable. Figure 10A Olmstead shows an interface circuitry of a display chip comprising a clamping circuit (131) connecting between said internal node and a non zero reference level for establishing a precise reference for each pixel before video bump occurs (col. 12, lines 47-57). Figure 3 of Kanagawa shows an adjustable low-pass filter (211) for eliminating high frequency noise. Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to implement

the clamping circuit taught by Peterson into the circuit of Obie for establishing a precise reference for each pixel before video bump occurs and to replace the fixed video filter (112) with the adjustable filter (211) taught by Kanagawa for eliminating high frequency noise. The variable resistor is element (2111). Note that it is inherent that the greater the bandwidth, the greater the display resolution is (see USPats. 3,908,193; 3,983,328; 4,676,105; 5,128,549; 5,394,750; 6,497, 666, 6,677,882, and 6,681,065).

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the combination of Obie, Olmstaed and Kanagawa includes all the limitations of claims 9 and 10 except for the limitation that the filter comprises a variable resistor and a capacitor. Figure 1 of Kwon shows a clamping circuit comprising a variable resistor (N1) and a clamping transistor (N2) controlled by signal (clamp_en) for adjusting the voltage at the internal node (col. 5, lines 12-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the clamping circuit (S1) of Olmstead with the clamping circuit taught by Kwon for adjusting the voltage at the internal node. The clamping transistor is transistor (N2) and the clamping signal is (clamp_en).

Regarding claims 11 and 12, the variable resistor is element (N1) of Kwon and the transistor is (N2) receiving a control signal (clamp_en).

Response to Arguments

In the Remarks, the Applicant argues that none of the references suggest the features "the greater said display resolution, the greater said bandwidth is" and "said clamping voltage varies with said bandwidth" in amended claims 1, 7 and added new claims. The newly added limitation "said clamping voltage varies with said bandwidth" is not found in the specification. It is old and well known for one of ordinary skill in the art that the larger the bandwidth of a filter, the larger the frequency spectrum passing through the filter i.e., the greater display resolution. For clarification, please see USPats. 3,908,193; 3,983,328; 4,676,105; 5,128,549; 5,394,750; 6,497, 666; 6,677,882 and 6,681,065.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hiep Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1752. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Callahan can be reached on (571) 272-1740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hiep Nguyen

01-27-06



TUAN T. LAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER